



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,489	01/11/2002	Robert J. Dugan	POU920010173US1	6712

7590

07/27/2005

Floyd A. Gonzalez
IBM Corporation
2455 South Road, P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

MARTINEZ, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2182	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/043,489

Applicant(s)

DUGAN ET AL

Examiner

David E. Martinez

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6,7,17-19 and 25-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,9-14 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/11/02, 2/11/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I - Claims 1-3, 9-11, 12-14 and 20-22 in the reply filed on 6/17/05 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 12-14, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,327,621 to Lee et al. (Lee) in view of US Patent No. 6,046,989 to Takahashi.

1. With regards to claims 1, 9, 12 and 20, Lee teaches In a data processing network [fig 5] having a server [Fig 5, element 500] with multiple partitions [fig 5, elements 521, 522, 523], a fabric [fig 5 element 550, column 3 line 59 to column 4 line 14], and a channel adapter [fig 5 element 500, column 3 line 59 to column 4 line 14] communicating between the partitions and the fabric wherein each partition has an assigned address [column 6 lines 40-53], a method of non-disruptively removing an assigned address comprising:

 sending a logout command from the channel adapter to the fabric, the logout command including an address to be removed [column 6 lines 62-65];

 checking the address to be removed with a table of active addresses to determine if the address to be removed is an active address [column 6 lines 53-62];

 changing the status of the address to be removed from active to inactive [column 6 lines 53-65];

Lee teaches all of the above limitations except for sending an accept response from the fabric to the channel adapter indicating that the address to be removed has been removed.

However, Takahashi teaches sending an accept response indicating that the address to be removed has been removed for the benefit of acknowledging to a requestor that an operation that was previously requested, has been completed so as to prevent the requestor from retrying the operating and using system resources [column 7 lines 42-57].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both Lee and Takahashi to send an accept response from the fabric to the channel adapter indicating that the address to be removed has been removed for the benefit of acknowledging to a requestor that an operation that was previously requested, has been completed so as to prevent the requestor from retrying the operating and using system resources.

2. With regards to claims 2, 10, 13 and 21, Lee teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the said table associates a partition identification with the address to be removed, said method further comprising;

including a partition identification in said logout command [column 4 lines 49-52, column 6 lines 24-65];

checking the partition identification from said logout command with the partition identification in said table associated with the address to be removed [column 4 lines 49-52, column 6 lines 24-65].

Lee teaches all of the above limitations except for sending said accept response only when both the address and the partition identification in the logout command match with the address and associated partition identification in said table.

However, Takahashi teaches sending an accept response indicating that the address to be removed has been removed for the benefit of acknowledging to a requestor, that an operation that was previously requested, has been completed so as to prevent the requestor from retrying the operating and using system resources [column 7 lines 42-57], and to assert that the right module performs a particularly allowed operation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both Lee and Takahashi to send an accept response only when both the address and the partition identification in the logout command match with the address and associated partition identification in said table for the benefit of acknowledging to a requestor that an operation that was previously requested, has been completed so as to prevent the requestor from retrying the operating and using system resources, and to assert that the right partition performs a particularly allowed operation.

3. With regards to claims 3, 11, 14 and 22, Lee teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said logout command includes an address of the source of the logout command, and the address to be removed is the same as the source address of the logout command [column 4 lines 49-52, column 6 lines 24-65].

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Martinez whose telephone number is (571) 273-4152. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEM



KIM HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/25/05